REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the above-captioned application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 13 and 17 have been amended herein in order to more clearly define and fully protect Applicants' invention. Allowance of all claims 1-20 is believed appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the interview on 20 April 2005 between Examiner Chervinsky and the undersigned, Daniel Krassowski, Ph.D. and Brad Reis of assignee Advanced Energy Technology Inc., at which time the subject invention and cited prior art were discussed. During the interview, it was agreed that should Applicants would amend the claims to provide more of an emphasis on the structural and thermal shielding aspects of the claimed invention, and to reduce the more functional language it would distinguish the invention from the cited reference to Richey, III (U.S. 6,131,651). To that end, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended in order to more clearly set out the structure of the claimed invention and its thermally shielding role. Support for these amendments appears in the specification at para. [0081]-[0082], on pages 38 and 39.

In addition, claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 have been amended to specify that the term "flexible graphite" as used in the claims refers to sheets of compressed particles of exfoliated graphite, as set out in the specification at para. [0014] on page 8. In addition, claims 1, 3, 11 and 13 have also been amended to correct the language

deficiencies noted in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, which should, accordingly, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 103(a)

All pending claims of the above-captioned application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or 35 U.S.C. §103 over Richey, III. However, as discussed during the 20 April interview, Richey, III does not disclose or even remotely suggest the use of sheets of compressed particles of exfoliated graphite to thermally shield either the external surface of an electronic device from a device component, or a second device component from a first component. Thus, the rejections over Richey, III should be withdrawn.

The remaining references cited but not applied have been reviewed and are not deemed sufficiently pertinent to require additional comment.

Accordingly, since Richey, III does not anticipate or render obvious the invention of claims 1-20, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is appropriate and requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that allowance of all pending claims 1-20 is appropriate. Such action is earnestly sought. If there

remains any matter which prevents the allowance of any of these claims, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned collect at 615.242.2400 to arrange for another interview which may further expedite prosecution.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time of one month to respond to the outstanding Office Action, extending the time to respond to May 6, 2005. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the extension fee of \$120 for a one month extension, as well as any deficiency attendant to the filing of this Response, to Deposit Account No. 50-1202.

Respectfully submitted,

ames R. Cartiglia
Registration No. 30,738
WADDEY & PATTERSON
A Professional Corporation
Customer No. 23456
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

James R. Cartiglia Waddey & Patterson 414 Union Street, Suite 2020 Bank of America Plaza Nashville, TN 37219 (615) 242-2400

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

I hereby certify that this Response To Office Action, including Certificate of Facsimile Transmittal are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. 703.872.9306 on May 6, 2005.

James R. Cartiglia

Signature

Registration Number 30,738